CASE NO.	0800	1580	7
ATTACHMEN	NT NO		
EXHIBIT _		<del></del>	
ΓAB (DESCRIPTION	v)		,

7

4

6

6

8

0

10

11

12

10

14

15

16

1.7

1 0

\_ C,

1, 14

21

2.2

2.2

2 a

THE COURT: Order of court, February 6th MS. PLACEK: What time does the Court want defense Counsel for evidentiary hearing, Judge? THE COURT: Do you think you can have that witness some time tomorrow? If you can we'll hear him when we can ger to him. If you can't have him here tomorrow, you may be abla to give us some indication as to when he can be here and we may be able to more effectively schedule him in for his convenience. MR. MURPHY: Judge, we will check tonight. Judge, as a matter of procedure, do you want the officer to be here as a witness in court or just to be available for the defense Counsel to interview? THE COURT: It depends what becomes necessary. It may become necessary for us to conduct a voir dire hearing to determine what is meant on the statement, or he may be able to satisfy Counsel on a one-on-one conversation and

issue may become mute. If not, we will confect y

he may be able to satisfy both of you and the

limited hearing to see if we can determine what 2 he's talking about. MS. PLACEK: Irrespective, Judge, like I said based on the court's ruling, I would be 4 5 answering ready. THE COURT: 9:30, tomorrow morning. 6 (WHEREUPON the trial of this 8 cause was adjourned and Ģ continued to tomorrow, 1.0 February 6, 1991.) 11 1.2 13 14 15 16 17 1.8 1 9 0.0 21 2.2 2.3

775

0.2

Case 1:08-cv-01589	Document 16-8	Filed 06/13/2008	Page 4 of 103	
$\sim$				
		S. Walana		
				e/
				-'
				·
		,		- Friedrich von der State von
				İ
				k
				ŀ

```
STATE OF ILLINOIS
1
                              SS:
 2
       COUNTY OF C O O K
 3
                 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
                 COUNTY DEPARTMENT-CRIMINAL DIVISION
       THE PEOPLE OF THE
 5
       STATE OF ILLINOIS
                            )
                               Indictment No. 88 CR 12517.
 6
               VS
                               Charge: Murder, etc.
       JEROME HENDRICKS
 8
                 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
 9
            BE IT REMEMBERED that this cause came on to be
10
11
       heard the oth day of February, A. D. 1991, before
12
       the Honorable LEO HOLT, Judge of said court.
13
14
            APPEARANCES:
15
                 HON. JOHN O'MALLEY,
16
                    State's Attorney of Cook County, by
                 MR. JOHN MURPHY and
                 MR. SCOTT CASSIDY,
17
                     Assistant State's Attorneys,
1 8
                     appeared for the People;
19
                  MR. RANDOLPH N. STONE,
                     Public Defender of Cook County, by
              MS. MARIJANE PLACEK and
              MR. VINCENT LUFRANO.
                 Assistant Public Defenders,
                 appeared for the defendant.
   J. P. Washington, CSR
   Official Shorthand Reporter
   2650 South California Avenue
   Chicago, Illinois 60608
```

1

2

1 T

THE CLERK: Jerome Hendricks.

(Defendant present.)

MR. CASSIDY: Correct.

THE COURT: You may be seated at counsel table, Mr. Hendricks.

Lady and gentlemen, yesterday, I took under advisement, the State's motion for leave to amend certain counts of the indictment, counts five through 11, I believe it was.

Am I right on that, Mr. Cassidy, where the State wished to strike the word "and" and add the word or insert a sentence of the indictment, causing the indictment in each instance to read: "By use of force or by threat of force"?

THE COURT: And that is counts five through

11, inclusive. I have had an opportunity to

consume some of the authorities on the issue, as

sparse as they are, and I have concluded that this

is a formal defect within the meaning of Section

111-5 of the Code and is subject to being amended.

Accordingly, see People versus Hayes for that proper section, the citation to which I don't recall right now. If it comes of memory, I will give the citation to Counsel; but, it is

jpsw2

1 People versus Hayes.

Accordingly, leave is granted to the State to amend counts five through 11, inclusive.

MR. CASSIDY: Judge, I don't think count 10 was one of them, but the other counts, five through 11 are all right.

THE COURT: Count 10 doesn't seem to have been included. I am going to also ask you if you would make the amendments as to those counts and as to counts three and four, which were granted leave to amend yesterday, if you would make the amendments on the face of the indictment itself.

(Indicating.)

MR. CASSIDY: Sure, Judge.

THE COURT: Also, the court had under advisement, the State's motion in limine in regard to other crimes evidence. And I was advised that the other crimes evidence involved an courrence which took place in 1984.

MR. MURPHY: Two occurrences, Judge.

THE COURT: And one, which took place at about the same period of time, both of them approximately 1984.

This indictment alleges an

ccurrence, which took place in 1988, a time span of approximately four years. After consulting the authority, I have come to the conclusion that in as far as intent, identity, common design, that the 1984 cases or occurrences are too remote.

On the other hand, if there is a sufficient similarity so as to meet the criteria set forth by the cases for a show of modus operandi, that may very well make the otherwise remote occurrences admissible.

I am unable to tell, at this juncture, whether or not there is a sufficient similarity between the occurrences to rule definitively as to whether it is admissible.

I presume that at the time that the other crime evidence is sought to be admitted, I will at least have a substantial factual basis of what this occurrence is all about; and upon certainly an offer of proof or under the bar examination of potential witnesses as to the other crimes, I will then be able to make a comparison to determine whether or not there is suffer similarity to allow the jury to hear the other crime evidence.

There is a case which the State

tendered to me, not in connection with this case, but in connection with another case, the name of which eludes me right now, but I can provide you with that, also, which provides a fairly good discussion regarding similarity and what must be sought in order to establish similarity, sufficient to meet the requirement for admissibility.

Mr. Murphy, you may know the case that I am talking about but I can't think of it right now.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, I can't recall offhand. I know there were a large number of cases I tendered on the other matter.

THE COURT: In any event, Miss Placek, I will give you the name and citation of the case when we next reconvene. I just, it won't come to my head right now, although I read it just yesterday. I guess I must be slipping. You can only keep so much in your head.

In any event, there are some other matters which are still under advisement that I'm not able to resolve for you now. I thought I would give you that bit of information, so as to aid you in the preparation of your case.

Mr. Murphy, is the witness that we were talking about yesterday in regards to that police report, is he available today?

MR. MURPHY: No, Judge, he is not. We expect that he will be here tomorrow; he is off today.

MR. CASSIDY: I called over there, Judge, he wasn't working yesterday. The person who answered the phone believed that he would be working tomorrow.

٧,

THE COURT: I am going to take about a two-minute recess. I am going to ask the sheriffs to allow the defendant to remain in open court and to have the jury brought into the courtroom. We will reconvene and proceed with jury selection.

MS. PLACEK: If it pleases the court, Judge, the state's attorney has led me to believe that, quite frankly, because of their negligence, I can't try my case to the fullest. We still have a Brady violation outstanding.

Although these state's attorneys, who claim that they didn't have five police reports, which in fact were tendered at the Office of the Public Defender last night, the absurdity of claiming they didn't have it, as a unity, in fact

2 1

when one would imagine they would be somewhat questioning about said reports if they were someone dealing with the motion, these were the police reports that were used.

So one would imagine that if one read the transcripts in preparation for the motion, one would find somewhat questioning as to these reports.

My suggestion in this matter, Judge, and I will put this in the form of a motion, is, number one, because of the fact that the State, in violation of the Brady Rule, after their admission that Brady material is in fact contained within the report --

MR. CASSIDY: That is not true; we never said that was Brady material.

MS. PLACEK: Judge, may I be allowed to finish?

THE COURT: I will let you respond, fully, until you have exhausted any response that you want.

Thank you. She is mistating the MR. CASSIDY: 23 facts.

> Judge, to refresh the court's MS. PLACEK:

10

1|1

12

**1**3

5

L 6

7

8

9

20

21

**2** 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

memory, the gentleman, when he said it the first time he just spoke, he saw the material. I think -- What did you call me, Counsel? What did you call me?

THE COURT: Miss Placek, please, address your remarks to me.

MS. PLACEK: I thought I heard Counsel refer to me in a derogatory term.

Your Honor, if it pleases the court, the issue before the court, becomes, because of the fact of the State's negligence, because of the fact that it now stands at 11:30, because of the fact, quite frankly, Judge, that Counsel, who argued and interrupted my argument previous to the statement stated to the court's questioning, that not only the material claimed within the police report was Brady material, but that the witness was in fact Brady material to this court's questioning to the fact; that I was here, approximately 9:00 o'clock, for the 9:30 setting, and this is the first time I have heard, I don't believe Mr. Lufrano may have known something, he suggested to me that perhaps the State couldn't get their witness today, but irrespective of that, Judge, I can't select a jury

\_\_\_

. 5

on that matter today unless I know exactly where I am heading with the statement contained within the report, unless the State is going to stipulate to that report.

MR. MURPHY: Are you finished, Counsel?

MS. PLACEK: Quite well.

MR. MURPHY: Your Honor, may I respond?

THE COURT: Surely.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, first of all, Counsel is completely in error in stating that the State was negligent. It would appear, from the defendant's own argument, Counsel's own argument, that she had these reports in her possession at least at the time of the motions.

Incredibly, Judge, if this is such an important issue, it is interesting that the very first time this comes up is on the eve of jury selection. If the Defense was so concerned about finding out about this anonymous source, why did they never file any motion in this courtroom, allowing this case to pend for two years?

Judge, the State was not negligent, in anyway. That report was, according to their admission, according to their argument, in their

possession; all the information contained in that report was in their possession.

3

There is no Brady violation here, Judge. It is ridiculous.

5

4

THE COURT: You have anything further you care to say, Miss Placek?

7

6

MS. PLACEK: Yes, Judge. I believe that there

8

was Brady material. The court so ordered, in fact,

9

that the witness be produced in this matter, Judge,

10

because of the necessity of holding credibility,

11

both in opening statements and trial tactics.

12

15

The State has deprived Mr. Hendricks

13

of in fact a vital issue. I would point out in the

We attempted, we were unsuccessful,

14 15

sustained the objection dealing with this matter

transcript, when this was in court, the court

16

during the motion.

17

18 we brought it to the court's attention. There was

19

no objection as too timeliness. And, quite

20

frankly, Judge, we are just asking the State to

21

live by the court's ruling as of yesterday.

22

MR. MURPHY: Judge, that is a

2.3

misrepresentation as to what happened in the

24

motion.

THE COURT: That is it, Mr. Murphy, otherwise, we will be here the rest of the afternoon arguing the case.

I don't know whether or not counsel is interested in the court trying to fix blame. If you are, that is not going to happen; I am unconcerned with fault. What I am trying to do is to assist the defendant in getting that which he is entitled to, if he is entitled to it.

On the other hand, one cannot help but agree that if this evidence was of such magnitude, that it was never brought before the court on a motion to cause the State to disclose; although it has been apparently in Counsel's possession at least a year and maybe longer; and knowing the way in which it would impact on trial, only when we commence jury selection, does the court hear that there might have been some failure to fully and adequately disclose.

I am going to conduct a hearing.

There are some other reasons why that approach is appropriate, too: Because Brady material, the burden of showing a failure, that, one, it was Brady material and, two, that there was a failure

to disclose is on the Defense.

It is also necessary in many instances that the defendant make a specific request to disclose, in order to preserve for error, any failure to disclose Brady material.

None of those things have been done in this case, which are not significant, in my judgment. If in fact there is something out there that is of importance to the defendant and ought be disclosed, I intend to have him get it and to try and provide a reasonable opportunity for him to make use of it.

That, it seems to me, is consistent with Brady. And it is consistent with the defendant's fundamental right to a fair trial. On the other hand, I am not going to indulge in the ridiculous process of trying to fix blame between adults who are professionals and where blame is not an issue.

And it wouldn't make any difference where I found fault. That does not resolve the problem that the court has, nor does it aid the defendant, which is the purpose of what we are trying to do here and that is to put the defendant

in the best posture that he can be in to receive materials which he is entitled to, if in fact he is entitled to them.

I am going to ask the sheriff to bring in the jury. Those persons who are seated on the left side of the courtroom, on my left, will please move to the right side of the courtroom, on my right. The jury will then occupy the other portion of the courtroom.

When the jury has been seated in the jury box, then the court will reconvene, commence jury selection.

MS. PLACEK: Before you do, Judge, if it pleases the court, because of the court's ruling, because of the actions, whatever you want to say, Judge, this case now takes on a different issue which I have discussed, time and time again, with my client, anticipating possibly certain rulings on certain motions.

We agree on certain rulings; we disagree on others. Because, with all due respect and with exception taken to the court, in dealing -- And I take it that the court had denied my motion for a continuance....

\_\_\_

1.0

THE COURT: If that is what you made.

MS. PLACEK: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: If that was a motion for a continuance, it is denied.

MS. PLACEK: (Continuing.) -- because this case now takes the aspect of, quite frankly, the Defense not knowing, because the State failed to produce their witness until tomorrow, and I take it that the court is proceeding with jury selection, there is a real possibility that we might go into evidence today, and I take it, since the State answers ready, they have their witnesses here, and since with a jury, the factual credibility of Defense Counsel and what is needed to be shown from the get-go, the simple strategy of the opening statement has somewhat, has been handcuffed to this defendant.

And, as I stated, Mr. Hendricks and I have discussed this time and time again, what happens, would happen if the court made certain rulings.

And, also, as I stated yesterday, as to the exceptions made when we asked the court to limit the State from in fact arguing in opening

نا

2.0

statement, the evidence dealing, where the court ruled on certain motions in limine, although asking them, as it is my understanding, to in fact lay proper foundation during the evidenciary matter and the court being an experienced trial lawyer, knowing in fact that once it is heard, especially from able counsel, and such articulation, once that it is heard, often is hard to erase.

its ruling, has turned this, that aspect of this case to where defendant's strategy becomes, he must fight it on the legal issues, therefore, for these reasons stated, we are at this time prepared to waive and we are answering ready.

THE COURT: Send for the jury.

MS. PLACEK: Judge, we are waiving the jury.

THE COURT: You are waiving your right to trial by jury?

MS. PLACEK: That is exactly it. Based on rulings of the court, it now becomes a different complexion.

THE COURT: Mr. Hendricks, would you please step up?

(Short pause.)

THE COURT: Your attorney informs me, Mr.

Hendricks, that you desire to waive your right to

trial by a jury and to be tried by the court.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Before I can permit you to do that, Mr. Hendricks, I am obligated to inform you of certain rights that you have, determine that you understand your rights and that you are waiving your rights freely and voluntarily.

If, at anytime, during the course of our conversation, you should change your mind and decide that you do not wish to be tried by the court, if you bring that to my attention, I will discontinue the conversation with you and your matter will be set for trial by a jury.

Also, if I say something to you that you don't understand, if you bring that to my attention, I will restate it or rephrase it until you do understand it.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Hendricks, you have a constitutional right to a trial by a jury in this

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

\_\_\_\_\_

1.0

case. A jury is composed of 12 persons who reside in Cook County. They would be selected by your attorney and the state's attorney. And it would become their obligation to listen to all the evidence produced by the State, in support of the charges against you.

Your attorney would be given an opportunity to cross examine each and every witness called on behalf of the State, with a view towards bringing out facts favorable to you.

You also have a right to call witnesses on your own behalf. And I will assist you in that regard by issuing subpoenaes to compel the attendance of witnesses on your behalf.

You, yourself, have a right to testify, if you so desire. On the other hand, if you chose not to testify, for any reason whatsoever, the jury would not be permitted to take that into consideration in determining whether or not the State's evidence proved your case, proved your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

After the jury has heard the evidence, the arguments of the attorneys and my instructions as to the law that applies to your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

case, the jury would retire to deliberate and determine whether or not the State's evidence proved your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Before the jury would be permitted to return a verdict finding you guilty, all 12 jurors, each one, must agree that the State's evidence proved your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: On the other hand, Mr. Hendricks, if you waive your right to trial by a jury, then I, and I alone, will determine whether or not the State's evidence proved your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Jury waiver?

MS. PLACEK: Judge, for the purose of the record, may I just ask the defendant one question for the waiver?

THE COURT: You may.

MS. PLACEK: Thank you.

Mr. Hendricks, I discussed what

1 would happen if the court made certain rulings; you 2 heard my representation? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 MS. PLACEK: Prior to waiving, correct? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. MS. PLACEK: And you are making your waiver of 6 7 the jury, based on the representation I made to the 8 court, because we have discussed this many times, 9 correct? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 11 MS. PLACEK: It is on this condition that you 12 are making the jury waiver, correct? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 14 MS. PLACEK: Sign this. (Indicating.) 15 THE COURT: Mr. Hendricks, if you are saying 16 to me that you are waiving your right to trial by 17 jury only because of the rulings that the court has 18 made, I will not accept your jury waiver. 19 MS. PLACEK: He is making 20 THE COURT: Excuse me. 21 Your jury waiver must be freely and 22 voluntarily done. It has nothing to do with 23 whether or not the court has made rulings that you 24 find proper or improper or anything of that nature.

It is solely your right to decide which form you chose to be tried by. And that is so that you are not in a position to say, but for the court's ruling, you would have not have waived your right to a trial by jury; that is not what we are talking about.

We are talking about whether or not you wish the court to try your case or whether you wish a jury to try your case.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Execute the jury waiver if you desire to waive your right to trial by a jury.

THE DEFENDANT: I do, sir.

(Short pause.)

THE DEFENDANT: On the advise of counsel.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, I would indicate for the record, I believe Counsel whispered something to the defendant, the defendant repeated it.

THE COURT: She wasn't trying to hide it, she said she told her client to let the record show that he was waiving his right to trial by jury on advise of Counsel.

MS. PLACEK: That is correct, Judge, I said it

498

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

.23

1 loud enough --2 THE COURT: The defendant has a right to 3 consult with his attorney, take that advise. I 4 have no complaints on that. 5 MR. MURPHY: All right, Judge. 6. MS. PLACEK: Your Honor, for the purpose of 7 the record, in my presence and the court's 8 presence, Mr. Hendricks has in fact signed a jury 9 waiver. I am tendering same to the court, asking 10 it become part of the record. (Indicating.) 11 THE COURT: Does your signature appear on this 12 jury waiver form, Mr. Hendricks? (Indicating.) 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: When you signed this document, was 15 it your intention to give up and relinquish your 16 right to a trial by a jury? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it was, sir. 18 THE COURT: Has anyone forced you, threatened 19 you or coerced you in anyway, including the court, 20 by anything that I have said or done, that caused

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Are you waiving your right to trial by a jury, freely and voluntarily?

you to waive your right to trial by a jury?

21

22

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 26 of 103

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the defendant has been advised of his constitutional right to trial by a jury. The court finds that he understands his right to trial by a jury and that he is waiving his right to trial by a jury freely and voluntarily.

MS. PLACEK: Thank you, your Honor. May the defendant --

THE COURT: The cause is recessed until 1:30.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, may I address the court?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, we are not ready to proceed today as to a bench trial. We anticipated we would spend the whole day today selecting a jury and consequently we have not had our witnesses, our witnesses are not in the building.

THE COURT: Are you able to get any of your witnesses together for this afternoon?

MR. MURPHY: Your Honor, I don't think we can because most of the witnesses are working, are in positions where it is difficult for us to reach them.

Judge, we may have one witness we

can put on, it was a witness who was here earlier this morning. I don't know if he is still here or not. I have to go upstairs and check.

THE COURT: Well, if you can; otherwise, I will continue this case until tomorrow but I don't wants to keep Counsel here until 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon.

MS. PLACEK: I have no problem with that,

Judge. I have kept the court waiting enough times,

waiting for me, and Counsel for the State, so I am

all right.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, I can go upstairs.

THE COURT: If we can start the trial today, fine. If we can't, then I will put it over until tomorrow. I understand that the reasonable expectation was that we would not reach evidence stage today and I didn't expect for that to happen either, so we can just put it over, if we have to, until tomorrow. You can be ready by tomorrow?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Sheriff, please bring the jurors into open court.

MS. PLACEK: Does the court wish to have us present?

THE COURT: Not unless you want to.

MS. PLACEK: I prefer not to, Judge.

THE COURT: You can take the defendant back to the lockup. Please, bring the jury in.

(Whereupon the following proceedings were held within the presence and hearing of the prospective jurors.)

THE COURT: Those ladies and gentlemen who are in the jury box, can resume their seats in the jury box momentarily, well, they can stay out there, since they are out there anyway.

Gentlemen, you may be seated.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, a person charged with the commission of a criminal offense has a constitutional right to a trial by a jury. He or she also has a right to waive the constitutional right to trial by a jury and be tried by the court.

After consultation with his attorney

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

this morning, Mr. Hendricks has elected to waive his right to trial by a jury and to be tried by the court.

Consequently, your services as jurors will not be needed and I am going to discharge you from further jury service for this term of your service.

When you leave here, after you have received your compensation, such as it is, from the sheriff, you are free to return to your respective homes, places of business or wherever it is you choose to go.

Before I discharge you from further jury service, on behalf of the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County and the members of my courtroom staff, which include my clerk, the deputy sheriffs, the court reporter, the assistant state's attorneys, and the defense lawyers, who are not here presently, join in thanking you for your jury service, notwithstanding the fact that you will not be serving on a jury for a term.

Nonetheless, your service is an invaluable, an indispensible part of our system of justice. It always sort of annoys me to find

people who make somewhat of an asserted effort, from time to time, to avoid the obligation of jury service.

And, yet, it is also true that almost every person that I meet, who is old enough to have an opinion about the criminal justice system, in fact has one, pro or con. And the opinions that they express sometimes run the full gamut, from extremely bad to extremely good.

And the fact of the matter is that the system that we have and that we say we want to preserve, is no better and can be no better than the persons who have input into it, including jurors. Our system of law is predicated upon the proposition that a jury will represent a cross section of the community in which we reside.

That cross section relates to sex, race, ethnicity, education, occupation, geographical location. All of those things are part of the picture that should go into being a representative jury.

And when people refuse to participate in the jury service, they eschew that mixture and dilute the administration of justice.

1.8

And so it is, no wonder that sometimes the results that we receive are unsatisfactory to us, but at the same time, many of us have neglected to perform the simple task of service as jurors.

I am happy to say that you are not one of those persons out there who find it is extremely expedient to avoid this service.

It is for those reasons that I take these few minutes to thank you for your service, to hope that in the very near future, each of you will be again called for jury service, that you will respond and that you will have an opportunity to serve on a jury.

It can be a very educational experience, a very rewarding experience and a very frustrating experience, all in one, at one time.

Those kinds of emotions can overcome you in your jury service.

Those of you who have not had jury service or those of you who have not had jury service in a criminal courtroom will be surprised as to how your attitudes and your perception of the justice system can change, once you have served on a jury.

<u></u>	1	Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for
	2	your service. You are free to leave. You are
	3	discharged from further jury service in this case.
19	4	Have a good afternoon.
	5	(Whereupon the proceedings
	6	in the above entitled cause
	7	were held in abeyance and
	8	called a later time the
	9	same day.)
	10	THE CLERK: Jerome Hendricks.
	11	(Defendant present.)
	12	THE COURT: Miss Placek, I am told that the
	13	State can't procure any witnesses for today.
	14	MR. CASSIDY: Correct.
	15	MS. PLACEK: Fine, Judge.
	16	THE COURT: I might also inform you, Miss
	17	Placek, that we will not likely hear evidence on
	18	this case a Friday.
	19	MS. PLACEK: That is fine with me, Judge.
	2 0	THE COURT: It looks like we have a short call
	21	tomorrow.
	22	MS. PLACEK: I have disappointed the court on
	2 3	trial. I would appreciate if we would start
	24	tomorrow.

1 THE COURT: Well, the question is what time. 2 I don't want to have you sit around here 3 needlessly. MS. PLACEK: I will serve, Judge, as I have 4 5 often said to you. MR. CASSIDY: The afternoon, 1:30 or so? 6 7 MS. PLACEK: I take it though, the witness 8 spoke of coming in tomorrow, won't be coming in, 9 Judge? 10 THE COURT: I don't know. We will see what 11 tomorrow brings. 12 MS. PLACEK: Then why don't we start a little 13 early for that witness? 14 THE COURT: The problem that I am having 15 early, I would like to start you at 9:00 o'clock 16 but I have what may turn out to be some lenghty 17 hearings in the morning. I will invite you in at 18 11:00 o'clock. 19 MS. PLACEK: I will be here. 20 THE COURT: But whether we can get you started 21 before the noon recess, I don't know. 22 MR. MURPHY: Judge, I would ask you set it 23 over to after lunch. 24 THE COURT: Set it at 1:00 o'clock and we can

start. She will be here at 1:00 o'clock? 1 2 MS. PLACEK: I will be here. 3 THE COURT: By agreement. MS. PLACEK: Just so the court is clear: 4 are still making a request for the witness, Judge, 5 6 under the Brady motion. 7 THE COURT: I am fully aware of that. 8 By agreement, February 7th. 9 MS. PLACEK: Thank you, Judge. 10 (Whereupon the proceedings 11 in the above entitled cause 12 were continued to the 7th 13 day of February, A.D. 14 1991.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

```
STATE OF ILLINOIS )

COUNTY OF COOK )

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
COUNTY DEPARTMENT-CRIMINAL DIVISION

THE PEOPLE OF THE )
STATE OF ILLINOIS )

-V- ) No. 88-CR-12517

JEROME HENDRICKS )
```

## REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the 7th day of Pebruary, A.D., 1991, this matter came on for hearing before the Honorable LEO HOLT, Judge of said Court.

## APPEARANCES:

HON. JACK O'MALLEY, State's Attorney of Cook County, By

MR. JOHN MURPHY AND MR. SCOTT CASSIDY, Assistant State's Attorneys, on behalf of the People;

MR. RANDOLPH STONE,
Public Defender of Cook County, By

MS. MARIJANE PLACEK AND MR. VINCENT LUFRANO, Assistant Public Defenders, on behalf of the Defendant.

21

22

23

24

1	THE CLERK: Sheet 6, Line 1, Jerome Hendricks.
2	MR. MURPHY: Could we have a few minutes? Mr.
3	Cassidy will be down momentarily.
4	THE COURT: It will be called momentarily.
5	MR. MURPHY: He has been involved in this other
6	matter all morning and it will give me an opportunity
7	to speak to the witnesses.
8	(Whereupon, there was a
9	brief pause in proceedings.
10	THE COURT: Are we ready now, Mr. Murphy?
11	MR. MURPHY: Yes, Judge.
12	THE COURT: State, I will hear your opening
13	statement.
14	MR. LUFRANO: Before opening, there is a Brady
15	motion pending.
16	THE COURT: I am fully aware of that and I am
17	fully aware of that since I was not duly advised to
18	the contrary that the witness that would be necessary
19	for that motion is not in Court.

MR. LUFRANO: He is in Court, your Honor. He is present.

MR. MURPHY: He is present. We gave the Defense Attorneys an opportunity to interview him.

MR. LUFRANO: If I might address him, I did

talk to him. While I was talking to him, Mr.

Murphy came in and in the middle, there were suggestions
as to the answers to my questions, so I cut the questions
short.

THE COURT: What do you want me to do about your failure to complete your interview?

MR. LUFRANO: I don't know. We would ask that the evidentiary hearing commence and that the Court call Mr. -- Call Officer Kaddigen as its witness.

We have filed a motion, there is nothing in writing in response to it and the problems with the report can be resolved by the Officer, himself.

MR. MURPHY: Judge, I have no objection to Counsel interviewing a witness and I take issue with him saying that I suggested any answer to the witness.

He has an opportunity to interview that witness, we brought him here specifically for the purpose of allowing the Defense Attorneys to interview the witness and we object to anykind of a deposition of a potential witness on this case.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know whether it's a deposition they are talking about, they are talking about voir dire examination of a witness in order to

determine	whether	or	not	he	is	in	possession	of
Brady mate	erial.							

He is going to be called as a witness today?

MR. MURPHY: Not by us, Judge.

THE COURT: How many witnesses do you have that you intend to call today?

MR. MURPHY: Judge, if there is enough time, we hope to put five witnesses on today.

THE COURT: Do you expect that to take all of the balance of the court day?

MR. MURPHY: I really don't know, Judge. It depends on -- It really depends on the length of the cross examination and I can't anticipate that.

THE COURT: What is the urgency, Mr. Lufrano, of calling that witness at this time, particularly since we are now involved in a bench trial and particularly since I will give you whatever time you need to perfect any investigation if I determine that there is material that should be given to you.

What is the urgency of it now?

MS. PLACEK: If the Court please, one of the reasons for the urgency in this matter stems from, first of all, the originalness of the Brady motion.

We have asked for several remedies, Judge, in fact to be had. The remedies, Judge, go all the way from dismissal to, in fact, a motion in limine barring the State from using certain material.

Your Honor, the proposition presented by this witness --

THE COURT: You are not answering my question.

MS. PLACER: I am about to, Judge.

THE COURT: Please get to it.

MS. PLACEK: The particular point that I am making is strictly this, Judge. In view of judicial economy, quite frankly, if the best happened on behalf of the Defendant, that is if the Court would be so inclined to grant a Brady motion with the ultimate remedy, there will be no need for calling any other witnesses.

and secondly, Judge, one of the reasons this motion, and I suggest, quite frankly, be heard before the trial is simply this, or at least a calling of this gentleman as a Court's witness, is that there would be objections as to foundational laying of what we, and I am speaking of the Defendant, anticipates witnesses to testify in line with the

State's case.

This is based off of the motions which were heard before your Honor. It is for this reason that we would ask the Court that this witness be called first, since I know the Court is egar to move on this trial.

not to call this witness first and progress, because of the rather long schedule and because I have no wish to inconvenience him, what I essentially would be asking is that this Court instruct the witness to come back on a later date.

THE COURT: The witness is not going to be excused from disclosing whatever information he has relative to this problem.

Can that witness be available tomorrow? That is the only work that we will be doing on this case tomorrow, anyway, and I will hear his testimony tomorrow as it relates to that one issue.

MR. CASSIDY: You are going to call him as a witness, Judge?

THE COURT: Someone is going to call him as a witness, I don't mean the Court's witness, but someone

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is going to help e	stablish the factual predicate for
what is meant by h	is statements in that police
report, whether it	's Brady material or not.
MR. CASSID	Y: Let me ask you this. Counsel
used the word urge	ncy all of a sudden, this is
important. The Co	urt already said they have known
about it before we	knew about it. Since it's
urgent, the witness	s is here, we are ready and I can't
see the problem, 1	et Defense Counsel talk to the
witness, let him he	ear what the witness has to say,
then let them bring	g in a motion.
	Almost a year ago when they got

when they got the report --

MR. LUFRANO: Objection to what we got a year ago.

MR. CASSIDY: I think that would be the proper thing to do. They want to have the witness deposed, bring him out in open Court and have a deposition, and I don't think, at this point, it's appropriate.

So I request they talk to the witness, let them make the motion more specific.

MR. LUFRANO: If I might clarify the record.

Counsel is indicating that we had it before they got it. He used the plural, we, I am 515

presuming he meant -- and I ask the record to reflect that we, the two State's Attorneys here, prior State's Attorneys are the people who tendered it out.

THE COURT: Mr. Lufrano, it doesn't make any difference one way or the other how that document came into your possession. You got it and nothing was done with it until we got ready to go to trial.

MS. PLACEK: Not exactly correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Ms. Placek, please, if you wish to interrupt me, that is all right, I will just let you tell me what I want to say and I won't say anything in response.

MS. PLACEK: I apologiza. I withdraw.

THE COURT: No motion has been filed to deal with that problem until we were about to commence jury selection.

Therefore, I cannot consider it to be of great urgency. If it was, you should have brought it up, it would seem to me you would have brought it up quite some time ago.

I don't understand, either, the concept of you, have the witness available to you to talk to, but you won't talk to him and you tell me that that is because the State's Attorney was suggesting

the	answ	ers	that	the w	itnes	s shou	ald ma	ake, a	nd I		
p <b>res</b>	ume	that	you	asked	me,	then,	to r	esolve	the		
q <b>ues</b>	tion	of	wheth	ner or	not	you a:	re ac	curate	in v	vhat	the
Stat	' 6	Atto	rney	was s	aying	or w	hethe	r the	State	8 ' 8	
Atto	rney	18	accus	rate i	in wha	t he	is sa	ying,	and I	row I	't
go 1	Lnto	that	: baca	ause J	don'	t kno	w how	to do	that	ŧ.	

If you have the burden on that and you ask me to make that resolution, you failed, because I find that, at best, that the evidence was equally balanced.

Now, it seems to me that to exercise what options you have and they all fall apart on you, put we will proceed in another way, but now you will assist the Court in resolving this problem, which you have an obligation to do and until that is done, we are going to proceed.

State, I will hear your opening statement, if any.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Judge.

Before I present opening argument, may I release the Officer, then?

MS. PLACER: How can we be two places at once, Judge, unless the State --

THE COURT: Are you going to bring that Officer

1	back tomorrow for a possible hearing?
2	MR. MURPHY: Judge
3	THE COURT: Then you can release him.
4	MR. CASSIDY: To be interviewed first and
5	then
6	THE COURT: He is not going to be interviewed
7	tođa y.
8	MR. CASSIDY: I understand, Judge. Just so
9	I can tell the Officer what the schedule is.
10	THE COURT: He may be interviewed and he may
11	also be questioned in Court.
12	MR. CASSIDY: What time, Counsel?
13	MR. PLACEK: I was here at 10:00, Judge,
14	whatever time is convenient for the State.
15	THE COURT: We have a big call. 1:00 o'clock.
16	MR. CASSIDY: Okay.
17	THE COURT: I will hear your opening statement,
18	Mr. Murphy.
19	MR. MURPHY: Thank you, your Honor.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

BY

## OPENING STATEMENT

MR. MURPHY:

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, I believe the evidence in this case will show that on the date of August 1st of 1988 the victim in this case, Denise Johnson, was 12 years old.

On that date she went to her cousin's house, her cousin, Yolanda Hill, and also to her cousin Karlena McCoy's house to babysit.

The evidence will show that she was at the address of 11720 Princeton. During that day of August 1st of 1988 she babysat for her cousin.

During the evening hours, at some point, she was sitting on the porch. The evidence will show that while she was sitting on the porch, she was approached by an individual who we will identify as the Defendant, Jerome Hendricks.

That a conversation occurred between Denise Johnson and Jerome Hendricks. I believe the evidence in this case will show that the Defendant, at this time, was attempting to come on to the victim. The Defendant was told to leave the

i	-	^	~	c	h	
ı	ν	u	Ŧ	U	11	4

The evidence in this case will also show that later that evening, the victim was seen with the Defendant.

Additionally, the evidence will show that the victim was seen near the home of the Defendant.

The evidence will also show
in this case, Judge, that on the evening hours of August
1st of 1988, the victim disappeared. Her family
and her friends looked for her that night, looked through -looked for her in the early morning up to the early
morning hours of August 2nd.

Police were contacted and she was not found.

The evidence, your Honor, will also show on August 8th of 1988, approximately seven days later, a body of a young female was found in a garage.

The evidence will show that that garage is next door to where the Defendant lived at the time.

The evidence will also show that that garage is behind an abandoned house, abandoned

at the time.

The evidence in this case will show that the body that was recovered was, in fact, the body of Denise Johnson and at the time, her body was severely decomposed, that there were ligatures on her body, there were ligatures which were, in fact, her shoestrings, two shoestrings tied both of her hands together behind her back.

Another shoestring was around her neck and also her top was tied around her neck or the upper part of her neck as well, that her pants were partially down.

Later that day, your Honor, the Defendant was questioned by Area 2 Detectives and initially the Defendant told the police, claimed that he had never seen the victim that night after 6:00 o'clock in the evening.

the evidence will show that, in fact, the Defendant told the police that he was somewhere else at the time, that he had no contact with the victim.

Your Honor, you will hear during this case that Area 2 Detectives listened to what the Defendant said, checked his story and found that,

in fact, it wasn't true.

with the fact that he had lied to the police about his whereabouts on the night of August 1st of 1988 and that after the Defendant had been confronted with the fact that he lied to the police, he then changed his story and admitted that he was with the victim.

Defendant gives the police various stories at this time. One story, he was with the victim, but there was no sexual contact.

The Defendant then changed his story and said that he was with the victim and that there was sexual contact.

The Court will then hear the Defendant went from admitting there was sexual contact to giving the police some detailed statement about sexual encounters that he had with the victim, Denise Johnson.

Judge, you will hear ultimately
the Defendant gave the police and an Assistant State's
Attorney a statement which was put in writing and it was
signed by the Defendant.

4 .

May we have a moment, Judge?
Your Honor will hear during the
course of this trial, specifically about what
the Defendant said in that statement to the police and
to an Assistant State's Attorney and I submit to
your Honor when you hear that statement, you will
be able to make a number of determinations about
the Defendant's actions on that night and, your
Honor, I would like to indicate to you what I believe
a portion of that statement of fact says and I will
read from this statement.

Mr. Hendricks said at this one point the girl wanted to pull on something, that it was around her face as if she wanted him to ride her like a horse.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he didn't know what it was and it could have been a rope or her shoelace.

Mr. Hendricks said that he did not pull on it, though, because he didn't get into it.

Mr. Hendricks stated that she had her hands balled up like she was despirate.

Mr. Hendricks stated he didn't say anything to her and that he was grabbing her around

her	waist	and	shou	lder.
-----	-------	-----	------	-------

MR. LUFRANO: Objection to reading what he intends to put into evidence as an opening statement.

THE COURT: Overruled.

This is what he expects the evidence to show.

MR. MURPHY: And in that statement, the Defendant went on to state, Mr. Hendricks stated that he had come and that he did come inside of the girl.

After he came, Mr. Hendricks stated he pulled up his pants and left and that he did not look back to see the girl.

He further stated that he knew that she did not come out with him.

Mr. Hendricks further stated that on Wednesday or Thursday, his family was complaining about a smell coming from the garage and he thought that the cat killed a rat.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he was cleaning up around the yard and that he was going to pull some garbage and branches in the garage, when he went into the garage, Mr. Hendricks stated that he saw something that looked like a body and went over to see what it was.

He said that it was the same girl that he had sex with and the shirt was still in the same position, over her head.

Your Honor, I believe during the course of this trial you will receive in evidence a statement stating that, along with other information about the night of August 1st of 1988.

at the conclusion of this trial, that you will determine from the statement, from the evidence about the Defendant's actions on the night of August 1st of 1988 and the various statements that the Defendant gave to the police, that the Defendant did commit the offenses for which he is charged.

would ask you in this case, and I know your Honor is an experienced Judge and is experienced in the laws of evidence, the rules of evidence, I ask your Honor only to consider evidence in this particular case, and I know you will, not what I believe the Defense will do, which is attempt to attack the victim, attack the police with evidence that doesn't exist, and I am confident, your Honor, at the conclusion of this trial, when you consider only the evidence in this case, that your finding will be guilty.

PENGAD/INDY, MUNCIE,

Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Placek?

OPENING STATEMENT

BY

MS. PLACEK:

MS. PLACEK: Very briefly, your Honor, we already made our objections, what we feel is the factual limitations of this Court, matters dealing with the motion in limine, that being, quite frankly, often bench trials are considered by Defendants as somewhat of a slow plea to get to the Appellate Court to retry the motions.

Quite frankly, in the case of Jerome Hendricks, Judge, the Defendant waives no rights and waives nothing but the flag.

exemplified by what the State just read, because the legal issue and written memorandum, which will be presented to the Court after the State's case, will show that, at best, the only thing that the State can convict Mr. Hendricks of is, quite frankly, criminal sexual abuse based upon the fact of having sex with a minor.

If I might be allowed to go into

、 5

the evidence and the argument, the evidence in this case, and the memorandum dealing with it will be, quite frankly, that the only thing that the State has is, in fact, one, the disappearance of a young girl.

Two, that, in fact, on August

8th the body of the young girl was found in a garage.

And as the State's Attorney stated, the garage was

next door to, in fact, the home of Jerome Hendricks.

Second, they have a statement given by Mr. Hendricks. Now, I am sure that the State's Attorney, in no way, wishes to falsify or mislead the Court on the evidence, but quite frankly, the statement which was read, and the statement which spoke of sexual intercourse and the statement which, in fact, speaks of whatever action Mr. Hendricks had with this young lady, speaks of the date of August 1st, 1988.

The reason this becomes key is because, as the Court knows, and what will be stated in our memorandum, that in order for the Court to find this Defendant guilty, the State must establish the corpus delecti of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.

The simplicity of this matter and the problem that the State will have is this.

No. 1, we believe the evidence will show that this girl was a chronic run-away. The reason this becomes valid is, first of all, because it will viciate the issue that possibly Mr. Hendricks was the last person to see this young lady alive.

We believe that we will show
that the police didn't even believe that Mr. Hendricks
was the last person to see this young lady alive because
a youth officer took a member of her family out days
after her alleged disappearance and went looking
for her.

second, we believe that the evidence will show that even if the Court was to accept the signed statement in the light most favorable to the State, it, one, speaks of no murder. Two, it speaks of no dead person. Three, it speaks of no kidnapping, a charge in the indictment. Four, it speaks of no forced sex.

Therefore, the aggravated criminal assault and felony murder, based upon the same, must also fail.

Basically, the argument is this.

There is only one person who knew what happened at that garage and that person is dead.

There will be no one else from that witness stand who will talk about the instrumentality of the death of this girl.

particular notice and pay particular attention to the fact, the evidence from the pathologist as to putrification and the date of death -- excuse me, Judge, I am on medication, I get very dry-mouthed and I get stumbling.

The point to that is that when the Court hears the evidence, when the Court, in fact, reads the law as suggested by the Defendant, the Court will see that the only thing that the Defendant can, in fact, be convicted of is the aggravated criminal sexual assault, based upon having sex with a minor.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Call your first witness, State.

MR. CASSIDY: The Paople would call Mike Gatto.

(Witness sworn.)

THE COURT: You may be seated, sir. That microphone is on. If you pull it over in front of you,

speak directly into it, keep your voice up so everyone will be able to hear you.

You may proceed, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Judge.

22

23

24

1	MICHAEL GATTO,
2	called as a witness herein, after having been first
3	duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY
6	MR. MURPHY:
7	Q Would you please state your name and
8	spell your last name, please?
9	A Mike Gatto, G-a-t-t-o.
10	Q And, Mike, by whom are you employed?
11	A Cook County Medical Examiner's.
12	Q And how long have you been employed
13	there?
14	A Nine years.
15	And what position do you have there?
16	A Chief X-Ray Tech.
17	Q And could you describe what your dutie
18	are as Chief X-Ray Tech?
19	A Take care of the X-Ray Department,
20	taka Y-Ravs.

Q And, Mike, could you tell Judge Holt what your education is in this area?

I graduated Henrotin Hospital in '80, Cook County Radiology Department

1	Q And in addition to that background,
2	do you have any specialized training in the area of
3	taking X-Rays?
4	A I keep up my CE credits on an annual
5	basis.
6	Q And what was your major field in
7	college?
8	A Science.
9	. Q Radiology?
10	Have you gone through any
11	particular courses in addition to your college
12	training?
13	A Recently going to Morraine Valley
14	to receive my Bachelor's Degree.
15	Q In what is that?
16	A In Radiology.
17	Q Now, Mike, have you ever attended any
18	Strike that.
19	Were you on duty, on the date of
20	August 9th of 1988?
21	λ Yes.
22	Q And what was your assignment that date?
23	A All X-Rays that came in that day.
24	Q And you were working at the Medical

Leading.

that to be?

	]
1	Examiner's Office, is that right?
2	A Right.
3	Q And on that particular day, did you
4	have an occasion to handle X-Rays of a particular
5	case?
6	A The one in question, yes.
7	Q What is the case number?
8	A 28 August '88.
9	Q Could you tell Judge Holt what is the
10	name of the victim in this case?
11	MS. PLACEK: Objection.
12	THE COURT: Objection is sustained.
13	MR. MURPHY: Q Mike, is that 288 or 6288?
14	THE COURT: Objection is sustained. Leading.
15	MR. MURPHY: May I approach, Judge?
16	THE COURT: You may.
17	MR. MURPHY: Q Mike, I am going to show you
18	what is marked as People's Exhibit No. 1 for
19	identification purposes.
20	I ask you to look at this photo
21 22	and tell me if you recognise what is portrayed in
23	that photograph?
23 24	What do you recognize that to be
47	A The deceased that I X-Rayed.

Q What is the case number on that
particular case?
MS. PLACEK: Objection. The exhibit speaks
for iteself.
<b>v</b> · ·
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: 8262, August, '88.
MR. MURPHY: Q Does that photograph truly
and accurately portray the condition of the person
who you X-Rayed?
A Yes.
Q Thank you.
Can you describe what you did
with reference to this particular victim? Or person?
A When they came in, I put her on the X-Ra
table, set up the equipment.
Q What equipment did you set up?
A General Blectric X-Ray Unit.
Q What did you do, then?
A X-Rayed the body and then put the
cassettes or took the X-Ray cassettes into the darkroom
and processed the films.
Q Now, Mike, could you describe the
X-Ray machine to Judge Holt?

G.E. X-Ray Unit, that is like an X-Ray

A

1	camera, that it takes the photographs or gives the
2	exposure to make the photographs.
3	Q You made reference to a cassette. What
4	is a cassette?
5	A A cassette is a film holder that has
6	both the film and the I.D. blocker.
7	
8	
	assembly in this particular X-Ray machine?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Could you describe that to Judge Holt?
11	A The I.D. plate is for name, case number
12	and our initials.
13	Q And did you use one in each of the
14	X-Rays you took in this particular case?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And what is the purpose of using it,
17	an identification plate?
18	MS. PLACEK: Objection.
19	THE COURT: Overruled.
20	
21	THE WITNESS: So we know one case from
22	another, one deceased from another.
	MR. MURPHY: Q Thank you.
23	And what was the condition of
24	the X-Ray machine that you used on August 9th of

1	1988?
2	A Excellent.
3	Q And how do you know that?
4	A Well, every morning we use it and if i
5	has to make an X-Ray, if it doesn't work, it will not
6	come up with a suitable radiograph.
. 7	Q Was it working properly that day?
8	A Yes.
9	Q: And, in fact, in addition to that, is
10	your X-Ray machine periodically inspected?
11	A Yes. Annually the Illinois Department
12	of Safety comes out and checks it.
13	Q Was that done in this particular
14	case?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And can you describe approximately how
17	many X-Rays you took?
18	A I don't recall how many.
19	Q Did you take more than one?
20	A Yes.
21	Q What did you do after you took the
22	X-Rays?
24	A After we exposed the film to process
27	them, put them in the folder, put the name and number

1	and give them to the doctor.
2	Q First of all, you take the actual
3	photographs of the person with the machine?
4	A Yes, right.
5	Q After you take the photographs, after
6	you took the photographs in this particular case,
7	what did you do?
8	A After I, meaning the X-Rays?
9	Q Yes, the X-Ray?
10	A Took the cassettes into the darkroom,
11	took the film out of the cassettes, ran the film into
12	a processor.
13	When they come out of the processor,
14	we put the films into a jacket.
15	Q So, you develope the X-Rays, then, is that
16	correct?
17	A Yes.
18	Q And did you have any training in the
19	field of developing of X-Rays?
20	A Yes.
21	Q And where did you receive that
22	training?
23	A Same school, Henrotin.
24	MR. MURPHY: May I approach, Judge?

	Ina cooki: Iou may.
2	MR. MURPHY: Q Mike, I am going to ask you to
3	look at what has been marked as People's Exhibit No. 2,
4	3 and 4 and 5.
5	I am going to ask you to look at
6	them one at a time.
7	Pirst look at People's Exhibit
8	No. 2 and tell me if you recognize what that is?
9	A Yes.
10	Q What is it?
11	A It's a post-mortem X-Ray of a pelvis.
12	Q Do you recognise that particular X-Ray?
13	A Yes.
14	Q How do you recognize it?
15	A By my initials and the case number.
16	Q And can you tell the Court specifically
17	what it is that you see on there that causes you
18	to recognize that particular X-Ray?
19	MR. LUFRANO: Objection. Strike the
20	objection.
21	MR. MURPHY: Q You said your initials?
22	A Yes.
23	Q Where are your initials?
24	A In the I.D. plate.
	41

	Q	What	else	is	in	the	I.D.	plate	besides
your	initials?								

MS. PLACEK: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: The case number, name of the deceased, the date of the examination and my initials.

MR. MURPHY: Q And what is that X-Ray of, Mike?

. MS. PLACEK: Objection, not qualified to read.

THE COURT: What about that, Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: I think he is qualified to

testify what it is.

MS. PLACEK: He said it was an X-Ray. There is no dispute as to that.

THE COURT: You are asking what is depicted in there. Is he qualified to be a person who is capable of reading X-Rays?

MR. MURPHY: Judge, I believe based on his background, at this point, he is qualified to say what is generally shown in the X-Ray. I am not asking him to interpret the X-Ray.

MS. PLACEK: With all due respect, I think the law in Illinois is that he might be able to take it, set

up the original foundation for whatever chain the
State is trying to use, but with all due respect to
the witness, I don't think he is qualified to read.
THE COURT: As I understand it, Mr. Murphy,
it is outside of his area of expertise.
At this point he may have the
expertise, but I don't think that you have asked

enough questions to demonstrate it.

Objection sustained.

MR. MURPHY: Q Michael, I am also going to ask you to look at the next X-Ray, that would be what is marked as People's Exhibit No. 3.

Do you recognize that particular X-Ray?

A Yes.

And how do you recognize that?

A The same as the pravious, it has the same case number, the name, date and my initials.

I am also going to ask you to look at what is marked as People's Exhibit No. 4 for identification purposes.

Do you recognize that particular

A Yes.

X-Ray?

1	Q And how do you recognize that?
2	A Same way, same number, same date, same
3	initials.
4	Q Finally, I will ask you to look at what
5	is marked as People's Exhibit No. 5 for identification
6	purposes.
` 7	A Same as the previous.
8	Q Name, number, date, initials.
9	And, Mike, those four X-Rays
10	that you are viewing, People's Exhibit 2, 3, 4 and 5,
11	are those all X-Rays that you took on August 9th of
12	1988?
13	A Correct.
14	Q Of the victim who, or the individual
15	who is portrayed in People's Exhibit No. 1?
16	MS. PLACER: Objection.
17	THE WITNESS: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Overruled.
19	MR. MURPHY: Q Is that correct?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Are those X-Rays, other than the People's
22	Exhibit stickers that are on each of those X-Rays,
23	are they in the same condition that they are in after
24	you developed them?
1	34

22

23

1	A Yes.
2	Q And do they, to your knowledge, truly
3	and accurately portray the victim's body, if I may,
4	when you took those X-Rays?
5	MS. PLACEK: Objection, again, not qualified
6	to reading.
7	THE COURT: Objection sustained.
8	MR. MURPHY: Q After you took the X-Rays
9	of the victim on Case No. 262 August, 1988,
10	or '88, what did you do with them?
11	A After I did what?
12	Q After you took them and developed the
13	film?
14	A Hand them to the doctor.
15	Q And she is the medical examiner in this
16	case?
17	A Yes.
18	MR. MURPHY: No further questions.
19	THE COURT: Cross?
20	MS. PLACEK: Very briefly, Judge.
21	
22	
23	

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

# CROSS EXAMINATION

BY

### MS. PLACEK:

Q	You are	not	John,	you	ara	Mike.	correct?
---	---------	-----	-------	-----	-----	-------	----------

A Correct.

I am sorry, you were introduced as John.

A That is okay.

Let me ask you this. In your job at the morgue, you don't take X-Rays of every person that comes in there or every dead person that comes in there, correct?

A Correct.

As a matter of fact, the only time that you are asked to take X-Rays is when there is a question of identification, isn't that correct?

A No.

Q Well, let me ask you this.

In this particular case -- Strike

Is one of the reasons that you are asked to take X-Rays is when there is a question of identification?

A That is one of my jobs, yes.

MS. PLACEK: That is all, Judge.

36

that.

1	THE COURT: Redirect?
2	
3	MR. MURPHY: No further questions, Judge.
4	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Gatto, you may step
5	down, sir.
	(Witness excused.)
6	THE COURT: Call your next.
7	MR. CASSIDY: Yolanda Hill.
8	MS. PLACEK: Excuse me, may I ask the witness
9	one question?
10	THE COURT: Yes. Would you return for just
11	one quick question.
12	(Witness resumed stand.)
13	MS. PLACEK: Q I do beg your pardon.
14	Do you know a gentleman by the
15	name of Dr. John Fitzgerald?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Who is Dr. John Fitzgerald?
18	A The Consultant Radiologist for the Cook
19	County Radiologists.
20	
21	MR. MURPHY: I do have one question.
22	
23	
24	$\pi a A$

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

#### REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY

#### MR. MURPHY:

Q Mike, you testified that you saw your markings on the exhibits, is that correct?

MR. LUFRANO: Objection, beyond the scope of cross.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. MURPHY: Is that correct, Mike?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Q The markings that were on there are your initials?

A Yes.

Q You customarily place your initials on each and all X-Rays you take?

A Yes.

And your initials are on these X-Rays the same as they are on any X-Rays that you take yourself?

A That is correct.

MR. MURPHY: Nothing further, Judge.

MS. PLACEK: I would like to correct myself.

When we say we both know Fitzgerald, it's Fitzpatrick?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
12

MS.	PLACEK:	I	missed	it,	too.
-----	---------	---	--------	-----	------

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Call your next.

(Witness sworn.)

THE COURT: You may be seated.

That microphone is on. If you will speak directly into it, keep your voice up, we will all hear you.

MS. PLACEK: For the purpose of the record, there would, of course, be an objection as to the out of order taking of the last witness, but the rule of certainty applies, since this is a Bench.

THE COURT: I didn't hear you.

MS. PLACEK: There would be an objection as to foundation testimony of the last witness because he was taken out of order.

I feel I must make it on behalf of my client, but because this is a bench trial, of course, the rule of certainty would apply.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.
You may proceed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## YOLANDA HILL,

called as a witness herein, after having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY

#### MR. CASSIDY:

Q Can you please state your name and spell your last name?

- A Yolanda Hill, last name is H-i-l-l.
- Q And how old are you, Ms. Hill?
- A 23.
- And where do you live currently?
- A 10530 South State.
- Q And on August 1st of 1988, where were you living at this time?

A 11720 South Princeton.

THE COURT: I am sorry?

THE WITNESS: 11720 South Princeton.

MR. CASSIDY: Q And is 117 South Princeton located in Chicago, Cook County, Illinois?

A Yes.

- And how long have you lived there prior to August 1st of 1988?
  - A For four months.

54

1	Q And who else was living at this address,
2	Ms. Hill?
3	A Karlena McCoy, my two kids and her two
4	k ids.
. 5	Q And what relationship was Karlena McCoy
6	to you?
7	A Cousin.
8	Q Was she living there prior to you moving
9	in.there?
10	A She had been living there.
11	Q Did you know a person by the name of
12	Denise Johnson?
13	A Yes, I did.
14	Q And can you please tell his Honor,
15	Judge Holt, how do you know Denise Johnson?
16	A Denise Johnson is my cousin.
17	Q And what was her date of birth?
18	MR. LUFRANO: Objection, hearsay.
19	THE COURT: Overruled.
20	MR. CASSIDY: Q When was she born?
21	A August 21st, 1975.
22	Q She was 12 years old on August 1st of
23	1988?
24	A Yes. she was.

1	house?	
2	<b>A</b> .	9:00 o'clock.
3	Q	That would be in the morning?
4	А	In the morning.
5	Q	And did you have something to do that
6	day?	
7	A	Yes, I went for a job interview.
8	Q	Now, when Denise came over to your
9	house, what	was she wearing?
10	A	She was wearing a black tanktop, white
11	pants that co	ome to her knees, white socks and some gy
12	shoes.	
13	Q	Okay.
14	-	The color of the gym shoes, what
15	color were th	nese gym shoes?
16	A	White.
17	Q	And these shorts that she was wearing,
18	how far did t	
19	A	To her Knee.
20	Q	The gym shoes, did the gym shoes have
21	a name brand	<b>;</b>
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	What was the name brand on them?
24		

Princess.

A

1	Q	And that was physically written on the
2	gym shoe, "Pri	ncess"?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Was there anything else on the gym shoes
5	written?	
6	A	Yes, her name was.
7	Ω	And her name would be what?
8	A	Denise.
9	. 9	And where was the word "Denise," written
10	on these gym	shoes?
11	A	On the left side.
12	Q	On the left shoe?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And where on the left shoe, Ms. Hill,
15	would it be?	Would it be on the inside or outside of
16	the shoe?	
17	A	On the outside.
18	Q	What part of the shoe?
19	A	The outside of the shoe.
20	Ω	On the outside of the shoe?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Okay.
23		But would it be on the instep of

the shoe, on the outside?

	li .	
1	A	Yes, it would be.
2	Q	And do you recall what color, if you
3	recall?	
4	A	Red ink.
5	Q	And how tall was Denise?
6	A	About five.
7	Q ,	About five feet?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	A little bit under or little bit over?
10	<b>A</b>	Under.
11	· Q	And approximately how much did she weigh?
12	A	About 100 pounds.
13	Q	Now, on August 1st of 1988, did you go
14	out to your jo	ob interview?
15	A	Yes, I did.
16	Q	Did you leave Denise there with your
17	children?	
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Did you return from your job interview?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And when you returned, did you return
22	to your house	at 11720 Princeton?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Was Denise there?
	45	

1	A	Yes, she was.
2	Q	Was your children there?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Approximately what time did you arrive
5	home?	
6	A	4:00 o'clock.
7	Q	Okay.
8		Now, approximately 5:00 o'clock,
9	were you still	in your house at 11720 Princeton?
10		Were you still home?
11	A	Yes, I was.
12	Q	Was Denise still there?
13	A	Yes, she was.
14	Q	Were your children still there?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Was Karlena still there?
17	<b>A</b>	Yes.
18	Q	Did you have an occasion then to walk
19	from your hous	e to, out to your front porch area at
20	5:15?	
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Can you tell his Honor, Judge Holt, who
23	was out on the	porch when you went out there?
24	A	Denise, my two kids and Jerome Hendricks.
	46	)

1	Q This person that you refer to as
2	Jerome Hendricks, can you look around the Court and
3	see if you see Jerome Hendricks?
4	MS. PLACEK: We stipulate she would identify
5	the Defendant.
6	MR. MURPHY: We accept that stipulation, Judge.
7	THE COURT: Stipulation will be accepted.
8	The record will reflect that she had identified the
9	Defendant.
10	MR. MURPHY: Thank you.
11	MR. CASSIDY: Thank you.
12	Where was Karlena when you went out
13	to the porch?
14	THE WITNESS: Karlena was walking behind me.
15	MR. CASSIDY: Q Karlena was out on the porch
16	after you?
17	A Yes, she was.
18	Q When you got out to the porch, then
19	with Jarome and your two kids out there and your
20	two kids, was there any conversation taking place?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Who was the conversation taking place
23	between?
24	A Jerome was talking to Denise.

1	Q Okay.
2	And after you got out of the
3	
4	porch, what else did you say?
5	MR. PLACEK: Objection.
6	THE COURT: Basis?
7	MS. PLACEK: Poundation.
8	THE COURT: Lay a better foundation.
9	MR. CASSIDY: Lay a better foundation?
10	· THE COURT: Yes.
11	MR. CASSIDY: Q Okay. You say that your kids
12	were there and Jerome was there and Karlena was there
13	and Denise was there, is that correct?
14	A Yes.
	Q Was there anybody else present?
15	A No.
16	Q Okay.
17	And this is about 5:00, 5:15, is
18	that correct?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And did you say anything to, at this
21	time?
22	A D Jerome.
23	
24	Q What did you say to Jerome?

1	MS. PLA	CEK: Objection, foundation.
2	THE COU	RT: Overruled.
3	MR. CAS	SIDY: Q What did you say to Jerome?
4	<b>A</b> ·	I asked Jerome what was he doing here.
5	Q	Okay. What, if anything, did he
6	say?	
7	A	He said he was just carrying a conver-
8	sation.	
9	Q	Okay.
10		What, if anything, didyou say to
11	him?	
12	A	I told Jerome that he was not allowed
13	on the porch.	
14	Q	Okay.
15		Did you say anything else to him,
16	at this time?	
17	A	No, I took my baby from him and him and
18	Karlena exchang	ged words.
19	Q	You took your baby from Jerome?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	What did you do with your baby?
22	${f A}_{\perp}$	Gave my baby to Denise.
23	Q.	What, if anything, did you say, at
24	this time?	

1	A After I handed my baby to Denise, I
2	bent over and told Denise, and she had got upstairs.
3	Q You said something to Denise?
4	A Yes.
5	Q What did you say to Denise?
6	MS. PLACEK: Objection. Basis as to the Defendant's
7	ability to hear.
8	THE COURT: Overruled.
9	MR. CABSIDY: Q Go ahead.
10	A I told Denise that Jerome had just got
11	out of jail for rape.
12	MS. PLACER: Objection. Motion for a mistrial,
13	Judge. The State obviously knew they were moving
14	into prejudicial material, Judge.
15	THE COURT: This is a conversation that she
16	had, Ms. Placek, there is no error. The objection is
17	overruled.
18	MR. CASSIDY: Q When you told Denise that,
19	what happened?
20	A Denise took the baby, she went
21	upstairs.
22	Q What did you do?
23	A Karlena and I was talking to Jerome.
24	Q What, if anything, did you say to

i	Jerome?
2	
3	A Told Jerome that Denise was 12 years
4	old and that she was not allowed to talk to any men
5	at all.
6	Q What, if anything, happened then?
7	A Karlena told Jerome to leave, and it
8	took Jerome about five or ten minutes to leave the
9	porch. We was arguing with him to get him off the
10	porch.
11	Q And did he eventually leave the porch?
12	Did he eventually leave?
13	A Yes, he did.
14	Q And then what did you do?
15	A I stood on the porch for a minute to make
16	sure that he was gone.
17	Q Okay.
18	And where, then, did you go?
19	A I went upstairs, me and Karlena went
20	upstairs.
21	Q Who was upstairs?
22	A Denise and my two kids.
23	Q What happened when you went up there?
24	A We went upstairs to talk to her.
	Q Did you have a conversation with her?

1	A Yes, we did.
2	Q O <sub>kay</sub> .
3	And then what happened after
4	that?
5	A We told Denise about Jerome.
6	Q What did you Withdraw that question.
7	Did you stay upstairs in the
8	bedroom?
9	A Yes, I did.
10	Q Okay.
11	Did Denise stay up there in the
12	bedroom?
13	A Denise came to me and asked me could
14	she sit on the porch, because I was hot.
15	Q What did you tell her?
16	MR. PLACEK: Objection, as to both statements,
17	hearsay.
18	THE COURT: What Denise said to her will go
19	out. What she said to Denise will stay in.
20	MR. CASSIDY: Q After Denise said something
21	to you, what did you tell Denise?
22	A I told Denise she could go on the
23	porch just for five minutes.
24	Q What, then, did Denise leave the room?
1	

1	A	Denise went downstairs.
2	Q	Did you stay upstairs?
3	<b>A</b> Z	I stayed upstairs.
4	Q <sup>v</sup>	Approximately how long did you stay
5	upstairs?	
6	<b>A</b> *	For five minutes.
7	o ·	And after those five minutes, then what
8	did you do?	
9	A	I came downstairs to check on her.
10	Q	And where did you go?
11	<b>A</b> */	Downstairs.
12	Q	Outside?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And when you went outside, did you go on
15	your front por	ch where you were earlier?
16	<b>A</b> C C	Yes.
17	<b>Q</b> [7]	And did you look around?
18	λ	Yes.
	Q	Was Denise there?
20 21	<b>A</b>	No, she wasn't.
22	Ω,	Was Jerome there?
23	A'''	No, he wasn't.
24	Q.	Did you ever see Denise alive after that
-7	time?	

1	MS. PLACEK: Objection, presuming.
2	THE COURT: What does it presume?
3	MS. PLACEK: Live or dead, Judge.
4	THE COURT: Overruled.
· 5	MR. CASSIDY: Q Do you understand my question,
6	Ms. Hill? Did you ever see Denise again
7	after you walked out that porch?
8	A No, I didn't.
9	Q Are you familiar with the area of
10	11720 South Princeton?
11	A Yes, I am.
12	Q And that is where you were living at this
13	time, is that correct?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Now, Princeton, is that bounded by the
16	strike that. Withdraw that question.
17	Did you have a chance to see a
18	diagram of the area up in our office prior to coming
19	down and testifying today?
20	Did I show you a diagram?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Did that diagram truly and accurately
23	depict the area of 11720 Princeton, although it was
24	not to scale?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A	Yes
<i>-</i>	I SE

MS. PLACEK: Well, Judge, with all due respect, Judge, the foundational questions have not been laid as to the knowledge of the area, independent of seeing the diagram in the State's office.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled at this point.

MR. CASSIDY: Judge, may the witness be allowed to get off, down off the witness stand and look at People's Exhibit No. 6 for identification?

MS. PLACEK: May I be allowed?

THE COURT: What are you going to say, Ms. Placek?

MS. PLACEK: Will I be allowed to move?

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. CASSIDY: I will be glad to move it.

MS. PLACEK: No, for the Court's pleasure.

THE COURT: You can proceed.

MR. CASSIDY: Q May the witness be allowed to step down?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: Q Could you step down, Ms. Hill, and walk over here. You can stand over here, Ms. Hill.

Now, is this diagram, People's

24

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
<b>16</b> \(\)	
<b>17</b> .	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

Exhibit No. 6 for identification, is this the same diagram you seen earlier?

Yes, I did.

By looking at this, would this be better for you to describe the area?

> Yes. A

Now, looking at People's Exhibit No. 6 for identification, what area, generally, does this depict?

Where I stay.

Okay.

And would that be approximately the 117 area of Princeton and Yale?

Yes, it would.

Looking on the diagram, although it's not to scale, do you see approximately where your house would be on that diagram?

Yes.

And if you would, could you please take Q this red marker and put an X, if you would, where your house would be?

Okay. For the record, Judge, the witness put a red dash.

Now, how many houses is your house

1	Off the alley which community
2	off the alley which separates Strike that.
3	Approximately how many houses are
	you from the alley, which divides, which is the alley
4	behind 11700 Block?
5	MS. PLACEK: Objection, form of the question,
6	Judge.
7	
8	THE COURT: Overruled. If she understands, she
9	may answer.
	THE WITNESS: One.
10	MR. CASSIDY: Q Approximately one house?
11	
12	
13	Q Are you familiar where Jerome Hendricks
14	was living on August 1st of 1988?
	A Yes, I am.
15	Q And do you see, approximately, or could
16	you identify it on this diagram?
17	
18:	A Yes.
19	Q If you would, could you take this
20	marker and put a cirlce approximately where Jerome
	Hendricks' house was?
21	For the record, the witness has
22	
23	marked the People's Exhibit No. 6, Judge.
24	Now, Ms. Hill, is that the rear of
	the house you identified?

That is the back.

-	Q Back of his house?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And if you would, could you put another
5	circle on where the front of his house would be?
6	A (So done.)
7	Now, on August 1st of 1988, was Jerome
8	Hendricks living in the approximate area where you jus
9	marked on that diagram?
10	A Yes, he was.
11	Q Was he living in a house?
12	A Yes.
13	Q And with all due respect, there would
14	be certain questions as to foundation of this
15	knowledge.
16	THE COURT: Your objection is sustained.
17	MS. PLACEK: Motion to strike.
18	MR. CASSIDY: Q Did you know where Jerome
19	Hendricks was living on August 1st of 1988?
20	A Yes, I did.
21	Q And how did you know that? Did you
22	see him coming to and from that house?
23	MS. PLACEK: Objection, leading and suggestive
24	THE COURT: Sustained. Leading.
	58 $5 \circ 5$

1	
2	MR. CASSIDY: Q Now, did you know where
	Jerome was living on that date?
3	A I seen Jerome coming
4	MS. PLACEK: For purposes of the record, with
5	all due respect
6	
7	MR. MURPHY: Objection. The witness is not
8	finished.
	MR. CASSIDY: Counsel's mouth is moving
9	directly when
10	THE COURT: That objection is overruled.
11	Please don't argue among yourselves.
12	
13	Put another question.
14	MR. CASSIDY: That is a misstatement, though.
15	THE COURT: Put another question and don't
	argue with Counsel.
16	Put another question to the
17	witness.
18	MR.CASSIDY: Did she finish her answer?
19	
20	THE COURT: I don't know what the answer or
21	the question was, no, because of the colloquy.
22	Put a question.
23	MR. CASSIDY: I apologize.
	How do you know where Jerome
24	Hendricks was living on August 1st of 1988?
- 1	

1	THE WITNESS: I seen Jerome coming out of there.
2	MR. CASSIDY: I have no further questions,
3	Judge, or no further questions of the diagram at
4	this time.
5	Can you resume your seat up there?
6	THE COURT: Mr. Cassidy, would you please move
7	the diagram back against the wall now?
8	MR. CASSIDY: For the record, I am showing
9	Defense Counsel People's Exhibit No. 7 for
10	identification.
11	May I approach the witness?
12	THE COURT: What happened to No. 6?
13	MR. CASSIDY: That is the diagram.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	MR. CASSIDY: Thanks.
16	Ms. Hill, can you please look at
17	People's Exhibit No. 7 for identification.
18	Could you recognize what that is?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Is that a photograph?
21	A Of Denise.
22	Q And was this the photograph taken of
23	her while she was alive?
24	A Yes.

1	Q And does it truly and accurately
2	depict Denise, how she looked when she was alive?
3	A Yes.
4	
5	and desired, four monor, I am
6	showing Defense Counsel People's Exhibit 8, 9, 10 and
7	11.
8	MS. PLACEK: No objection, Judge.
	Thank you.
9	. MR. CASSIDY: Q Ms. Hill, I will show you
10	what is marked as People's Exhibit No. 8 for
11	identification.
12	I ask you to look at that photo-
13	graph and do you recognize what is depicted in this
14	photograph?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And can you please tell the Judge what
17	that photograph shows?
18	
19	whole belowe beay at.
20	MR. LUFRANO: We can't hear. If she could speak
21	up a bit.
22	THE COURT: Try to speak into the microphone.
23	Keep your voice up.
24	MR. CASSIDY: Q Let me ask you this, Ms. Hill.
	Next to Jerome's house, on August
	1st of 1988, there was a garage, isn't that correct?

1	MR. LUFRANO: Objection.
2	MS. PLACEK: Objection, leading and suggestive.
3	THE COURT: Sustained. Leading.
4	MR. CASSIDY: Q Please tell the Judge what
5	People's Exhibit No. 8 shows?
6	MS. PLACEK: Objection, it was previously
7	identified, it will speak for itself.
8	THE COURT: Overruled.
9	MR. CASSIDY: Q What does People's Exhibit
10	No. 8, what does that photograph show, Yolanda?
11	A It was a garage right here.
12	Q What is there now instead of the
13	garage?
14	A Nothing but a pathway.
15	Q All right.
16	And what alse is shown in the
17	photograph, besides where the garage used to be?
18	A My house, where I used to live.
19	Q I will show you what is marked as People's
20	Exhibit No. 9 for identification.
21	Do you recognize what is shown in
22	that photograph, Ms. Hill?
23	A Yes.
24	Q And please tell the Judge what that $59$

1	photograph shows?
2	A This photograph?
3	Q Just tell him what it shows, to his
4	Honor.
5	A Where the garage used to be at.
6	Q What garage are you referring to?
7	A The garage that Denise was found in.
8	MS. PLACEK: Objection, unless the foundation
9	can be shown as to knowledge.
10	MR. CASSIDY: Objection is sustained.
11	MS. PLACEK: I ask to strike.
12	THE COURT: Stricken.
13 -	MR. CASSIDY: Q What does that photograph
14	show?
15	MS. PLACEK: Objection, asked and answered.
16	THE COURT: Overruled.
17	THE WITNESS: The garage that used to be there
18	MR. CASSIDY: Q Okay.
19	The garage that used to be where?
20	A In the back of the house.
21	Q All right.
22	And is Jerome's house also shown
23	in that photograph?
24	A Yes, it is.

	Q The garage you are referring to,
1	where was that in relationship to Jerome's house?
2	A Next door to Jerome's.
3	Q Okay.
4	And for the record, if you would,
5	can you put, or what color is Jerome's house in
6	that photograph?
7	A Green.
8	Q I will show you now what is marked
9	as People's Exhibit No. 10 for identification.
10	Take a look at it.
11	Do you recognize what is shown
12	in that photograph?
13	A Yes.
14	Q What is shown in the photograph?
15	A Jerome's house and the house that
16	is next door to him and the garage.
17	Q What is shown in the photograph is
18	Jerome's house and what else?
19	A And the house and where the garage was
20	standing.
21	Q Where the garage used to be?
22	A Yes.
23	Q The garage thatwas there on August 1st
24	64

of 1988?		
A		Yes.
Q	)	It's no longer there, is that correct?
A		No.
q	<b>)</b>	Finally, I will show what is marked
as People	's Ex	hibit No. 11 for identification. Can
you take	that.	
		Take a look at it. Do you
recogniza	what	is contained, what is depicted in that
photograp	ph?	
,	A. T	Yas.
Ç	Q	And what is shown in that photograph,
Ms. Hill?	?	
1	A	This is from our porch, you can see the
garage.		
(	Q	Okay.
		It shows the angle from your front
porch that	t you v	vere living in on August 1st of 1988?
	A	Yes, where the garage was standing at.
(	Q	Where the garage used to be?
1	A	Yes.
•	Q	Is that what is depicted?
į	A	Yes.

Do all of those four photographs that

you just described, do they truly and accurately show

1	what you just described?
2	A Yes, it is.
3	Q Did Denise ever go to Roseland Community
4	Hospital?
5	A Yes, she did.
6	MS. PLACEK: Objection. Objection, foundation.
7	THE COURT: Objection sustained.
8	Ms. PLACEK: Motion to strike.
9	. THE COURT: Stricken.
10	MR. CASSIDY: Could I have just a moment, your
11	Honor?
12	THE COURT: Mr. Cassidy, I am going to reverse
13	that ruling as to that question and allow her to
14	answer.
15	MR. CASSIDY: Okay.
16	Could I just have a moment,
17	please, Judge?
18	THE COURT: All right.
19	MR. CASSIDY: Q Now, Ms. Hill, when you left
20	Denise and she went downstairs, back to the front porch
21	and you stayed upstairs, was she in fine physical
22	condition?
23	A Yes, she was.
24	Q Was she alive, as well?

1	A Yes.
2	Q And when was the next time that you
3	saw her?
4	MS. PLACEK: Objection, presuming.
5	THE COURT: Overruled.
6	MR. CASSIDY: Q When was the next time that
7	you saw her?
8	A When she came downstairs.
9	Q All right.
10	After you went out the front
11	porch, you didn't see her again, or you didn't see
12	her on that day, is that right?
13	MR. LUFRANO: Objection, leading and suggestive.
14	THE COURT: Overruled.
15	MR. CASSIDY: Q You didn't see her that day,
16	did you?
17	A After the 1st, no.
18	Q Okay.
19	Did you ever see her again?
20	A No.
21	MR. CASSIDY: Thank you, your Honor, I have
22	no further questions.
23	THE COURT: Cross?
24	MS. PLACEK: Very briefly, your Honor.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

### CROSS EXAMINATION

BY

#### MS. PLACEK:

Ms. Hill, if I say anything you don't understand or if I state a question to you that you have a problem with --

MR. CASSIDY: Objection, Judge.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. PLACEK: I will try to restate it, okay?

A All right.

Now, Ms. Hill, first of all speaking about your cousin, did you ever tell the police that you were, in fact, her aunt?

MR. CASSIDY: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. CASSIDY: Foundation.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. CASSIDY: Objection, Judge, to the foundation.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't.

MS. PLACEK: Q Calling your attention --

THE COURT: That is when the foundation becomes relevant.

MR. MURPHY: It's	relevant.
------------------	-----------

THE COURT: Okay.

THE COURT: If she told the police she had a different relationship than what she is now testifying to, it may become relevant.

MR. CASSIDY: Impeachment, for impeachment.

MR. CASSIDY: Correct me if I am wrong, I have been wrong alot today, isn't it correct that, first of all, you, to establish that, you have to have a conversation with a policeman?

THE COURT: She has just denied that she told the police that. Now we are going to find out when it was that Counsel --

MR. CASSIDY: I had to lay a foundation. I am just asking the same thing.

THE COURT: Mr. Cassidy, 315 South Plymouth Court they give refresher courses on evidence, Chicago, Illinois.

MR. CASSIDY: Right. I need it.

THE COURT: Proceed.

MS. PLACEK: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: This case is not going to proceed
like this all through this case with us arguing between
ourselves about irrelevances. We are trying to try

this case as skilled lawyers without arguments between Counsel and the Court.

# Proceed.

MS. PLACEK: Q Be that as it may, do you remember having a conversation approximately on August 7th of 1990 -- Strike that, 1988, with an Officer, a Youth Officer Steve Martkovich, M-a-r-t-k-o-v-i-c-h?

A No.

Do you remember, at this time, that he spoke to you approximately -- that he spoke to you concerning your missing relative, Denise Johnson, your niece?

A No.

O Do you remember whether or not he asked you what your relationship was to Denise Johnson?

A I don't remember speaking to anyone by that name.

Do you remember whether or not you told him, at that time, that you were, in fact, her aunt?

A No.

THE COURT: No, you do not remember or no, -THE WITNESS: No, I do not remember.

MS. PLACEK: Q Do you remember that conversation